

REMARKS

Claims 2, 6, 14, 17, 20, 23-27, and 35-62 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7-13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 28-35, and 63-78 are pending. Claim 71 is currently amended. Claims 18-22 are allowed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of all outstanding rejections are respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 3-16, 18-22, 28-35 and 63-70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0014486 to Glenn. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The present invention provides a die package having an adhesive flow restriction area. The adhesive flow restriction area impedes the flow of an adhesive material that is used in bonding a transparent element to a die to form the package. Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "a die . . . and a transparent element adhesively attached to said die by an adhesive material and having a first surface facing a first surface of said die, said first surface of said transparent element having an adhesive flow restriction area forming a perimeter surrounding said array of imaging elements for impeding flow of an adhesive across said first surface of said die."

Glenn fails to teach or suggest "a transparent element . . . having an adhesive flow restriction area forming a *perimeter* surrounding said array of imaging elements for impeding flow of an adhesive across said first surface of said die" on a first side of the transparent element. Unlike the claimed invention, Figure 19 of Glenn relates to an "encapsulant locking feature" [0095], having a groove 90 which "increases the surface area of cover 89 in contact with bead 48, and thereby strengthens the connection between cover 89 and bead 48 and package 30." In the embodiment shown in Fig. 19, the groove 90 is centered over the bead 48 and does nothing to restrict the flow of the

adhesive in either direction on the die. Moreover, Glenn does *not* disclose, teach, or suggest “an adhesive flow restriction area forming a perimeter surrounding said array of imaging elements,” as recited by claim 1.

Further, Glenn does not disclose “restriction areas . . . configured on the perimeter of the transparent element,” as suggested by the Office Action at page 2. The only discussion of the perimeter of the transparent element in Glenn relates to the shape of the element; nowhere does Glenn contemplate the shape, size or configuration of the restriction area.

The Office Action has withdrawn its previous rejection of the claims as being anticipated by Glenn under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), but now re-rejects these claims as being unpatentable over Glenn alone under section 103(a). The rejection fails for two reasons. First, by the Office Action implicitly admits that Glenn does not anticipate the rejected claims, but fails to identify what claim limitations are not shown. Applicants respectfully submit that at the very least, “an adhesive flow restriction area forming a perimeter surrounding said array of imaging elements” is not shown by Glenn, as discussed above. Second, the Office Action makes no showing of a teaching, motivation or suggestion, absent Applicants’ disclosure, to modify Glenn in such a way that all the claim limitations would be present. Because no reference or combination of references discloses all of the claim limitations, Applicants respectfully request that, for at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 1 and all dependent claims be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claim 71 recites, *inter alia*, “a die . . . and a transparent element adhesively attached to said die by an adhesive material and having a first surface facing a first surface of said die, said first surface of said transparent element having at least one adhesive flow restriction area forming a *perimeter* surrounding said array of imaging

elements comprising of at least one protuberance capable of impeding flow of an adhesive across said first surface of said die.”

Glenn fails to teach or suggest “[a] first surface of said transparent element having at least one adhesive flow restriction forming a perimeter surrounding said array of imaging elements area comprising of at least one protuberance capable of impeding flow of an adhesive across said first surface of said die,” as recited by claim 71. Glenn does not disclose, teach or suggest a protuberance on a first surface of said transparent element. Additionally, as discussed above, the Office Action does not disclose any reference or combination of references which show all of the claim limitations. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 71, and its dependent claims 72-78, are allowable over Glenn.

Claims 63-70 depend from allowed independent claim 18. Applicants respectfully submit that the outstanding rejection of claims 63-70 is improper. Applicants respectfully submit that the outstanding rejection of claims 63-70 be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Application No. 10/751,441
Amendment dated June 23, 2006
Reply to Office Action of March 23, 2006

Docket No.: M4065.1005/P1005

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: June 23, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'T. D'Amico', is written over a horizontal line.

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Jerome A. DeLuca

Registration No.: 55,106

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorney for Applicant